

**RE: UC - EPA vermiculite data request - response 11122010**

**Brattin, Bill** to: Eric Borton

12/09/2010 12:20 PM

From: "Brattin, Bill" <brattin@srcinc.com>

To:

Cc: benson.bob@epa.gov

---

Eric

There are 4 individuals in the 1980 data set with a date of hire of 6/1/1980.

Workers are: 10395, 12493, 14061, 19802

Because of this, the date of x-ray is set at 6/1/1980.

However, you have calculated a CHEEC that is greater than zero for all 4 people.

Is this CHEEC the exposure that occurred on the day of 6/1/1980 (i.e., a 1 day exposure), or did you assume some other dates for the day of x-ray?

Thanks for your help.

\*\*\*\*\*

Bill Brattin

SRC, Inc.

999 18th Street, Suite 1975

Denver CO 80202

brattin@srcinc.com

303-357-3121

---

From: Eric Borton [eric.borton@uc.edu]

Sent: Wednesday, December 01, 2010 10:04 AM

To: Benson.Bob@epamail.epa.gov

Cc: Hilbert, Timothy (hilbertj); Borton, Eric (bortonek); Brattin, Bill; Lemasters, Grace (lemastgj); Lockey, James (lockeyje); Rice, Carol (ricech)

Subject: Re: UC - EPA vermiculite data request - response 11122010  
Bob,

Attached is the updated CHEEC (Table 4, N=280), new CHEEC to 1980 (Table

8, N=513), X-ray outcomes in 1980 (Table 9, N=513) and corrected year

1977 exposure matrix (Table 4).

Eric

On 11/29/2010 10:42 AM, Benson.Bob@epamail.epa.gov wrote:  
> Thank you for the clarification on 17352 and 17847 and the  
information  
> on x-ray improvements.  
>  
> Can you provide an estimate of when the 1980 CHEEC values will be  
> available? We are scheduled to do a briefing for Superfund  
managment in  
> DC next week.  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> From: "Hilbert, Timothy (hilbertj)"<HILBERTJ@UCMAIL.UC.EDU>  
> To: Bob Benson/R8/USEPA/US@EPA  
> Cc: "brattin@srcinc.com"<brattin@srcinc.com>, "Borton, Eric  
> (bortonek)"<BORTONEK@UCMAIL.UC.EDU>, "Lockey, James  
> (lockeyje)"<lockeyje@UCMAIL.UC.EDU>, "Lemasters,  
Grace  
> (lemastgj)"<LEMASTGJ@ucmail.uc.edu>, "Rice, Carol  
(ricech)"  
> <ricech@ucmail.uc.edu>  
> Date: 11/24/2010 06:11 AM  
> Subject: RE: UC - EPA vermiculite data request - response  
11122010  
>  
>  
>  
> Bob,  
>  
> The two workers 10395 and 14061 had X-rays at the time of their  
hire so  
> your modification of the X-ray date to 6/1/80 is fine.  
>  
> There were no data entry errors regarding 17352 and 17847. We  
don't  
> have their x-rays or B-reader forms from 1980 so all we know is  
the  
> diffuse/discrete determination. However, the 2004 B-reader forms  
for  
> 17352 indicate pleural changes that could easily have been marked  
as  
> diffuse pleural thickening (in fact, 1 of the 3 readers did so).  
We  
> believe 17352 still has the same pleural changes that were called

> diffuse pleural thickening in 1980. Regarding 17847...the discrete  
> changes from 1980 could have been an over-call or the 2004 could have  
> been an under-call. In any case, he is no longer positive.  
>  
> There were no technological improvements in radiographic equipment  
> between 1980 and 2004 that would have a substantially impact on the  
> readings. There also were no differences in overall film quality that  
> would have a substantial impact on the readings.  
>  
> We will get back to you shortly regarding 1980 CHEEC values.  
>  
> Thanks  
> Tim  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Benson.Bob@epamail.epa.gov  
[mailto:Benson.Bob@epamail.epa.gov]  
> Sent: Monday, November 15, 2010 3:43 PM  
> To: Borton, Eric (bortonek)  
> Cc: brattin@srcinc.com; Hilbert, Timothy (hilbertj)  
> Subject: Re: UC - EPA vermiculite data request - response  
11122010  
>  
> It turns out that we also need the CHEEC calculation as of the date of  
> x-ray in 1980. We suggest using the CHEEC as of 05/31/1980 to match the  
> seasonal work schedule.  
>  
> You can either do the full 513 or re-do only those with asbestos  
other =  
> 0 and job-stop>06/01/1980. Your choice. My count shows the later to  
> be n = 271.  
>  
> I hope this will be our final request for data. We are getting close to

> an exposure-response model that we think will work.  
>  
> We noted there were two workers (#10395 and #14061) who were not  
hired  
> until 06/01/1980, but were included in the 513, so we modified  
the x-ray  
> date to 06/01/1980. Please check the records for the hire dates  
for  
> these two.  
>  
> We also noted two discrepancies when comparing the health  
endpoint in  
> 1980 versus 2004. See list below.  
>                   #17352 diffuse in 1980; no radiographic change in  
2004  
>                   #17847 discrete in 1980, no radiographic change in  
2004  
> Please check whether there is a data entry error or a difference  
in  
> diagnosis by the readers.  
>  
> When we were talking with NCEA last week a question came up about  
the  
> quality of the films and x-ray equipment in 2004 versus 1980.  
This is a  
> question for Jim:  
>                   Were there improvements made between 1980 and 2004  
that  
> would have  
> a substantial effect on the reliability of the diagnosis in 1980?  
>  
>  
>  
> .  
>